

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have canceled claims 1-10 and 17-20. Claims 11-16 remain pending.

The office action objected to the drawings for various reasons in Paragraph 1 regarding the lead lines and other formal reasons. On October 22, 2004, however, the Applicants submitted formal drawings, thus obviating these concerns. Applicants have included a copy of that submission for the Examiner's convenience. Note that the submission does not have the correction made in this Amendment.

Also in Paragraph 1, the office action mentions that Figure 4 appears to suggest a single sensor, although the disclosure discloses that Figure 4 is representative of a plurality of sensors. The Applicants agree and note that those two statements are consistent. Specifically, although the process of Figure 4 makes plural sensors, it necessarily makes one sensor (i.e., one of the sensors being made). In other words, the process of Figure 4 makes one sensor (the sensor of interest) and other sensors. Accordingly, the Applicants did not see the need to amend the drawing or specification.

In Paragraph 2, the office action notes that Figure 3 does not show reference number "26." Applicants thus have amended Figure 3 to include that reference number (see attached Replacement Sheet). No changes with regard to Paragraph 3 of the office action is necessary since claim 19 was canceled.

The office action objected to the specification because the word, "figure" was not capitalized. Applicants accordingly submit herewith a substitute specification capitalizing the word as requested by Examiner. A similar change was made for the word, "act."

The office action rejected claims 1-10 and 17-20 for various reasons. These rejections are not addressed, however, because they are moot in view of their cancellation.

The office action also rejected Claim 11 as being obvious under 35 USC§ 103(a) in view of U.S. 2004/0077154 (Nagarajan et al.) and U.S. 6,448,109 (Karpman). It is noted that Karpman is owned by Analog Devices, Inc. of Norwood, Ma. Analog Devices, Inc., however, also owns this patent application. Accordingly, this rejection of claim 11 is

inappropriate in view of 35 USC §103(c), which states that "subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

In this case, at the time the invention of this application was made, it was subject to an obligation of assignment to Analog Devices, Inc. In like fashion, at that same time, Karpman either was owned by Analog Devices, Inc., or subject to an obligation of assignment to Analog Devices, Inc. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 11 is improper, and Claim 11 is allowable in view of the cited art. In addition, Claims 12-16, which depend from Claim 11, also are allowable for the same reasons.

Applicants also note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed with this Amendment.

The application thus is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Steven Saunders, if it will assist examination of the pending claims.

Applicants also request a one month extension of time. Please charge the fee to deposit account number 19-4972.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven G. Saunders  
Registration No. 36,265

02550/00176 341693.1

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. This sheet, which includes Figures 3-5, replaces the original sheet including Figures 3-5. In Figure 3, previously omitted reference number 26 has been added.